



# UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE  
United States Patent and Trademark Office  
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS  
P.O. Box 1450  
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450  
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
09/801,613	03/08/2001	Leland James Wieschuegel	AUS920010024US1	5323
45993	7590	12/19/2005	EXAMINER	
IBM CORPORATION (RHF) C/O ROBERT H. FRANTZ P. O. BOX 23324 OKLAHOMA CITY, OK 73123			ZURITA, JAMES H	
			ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
			3625	

DATE MAILED: 12/19/2005

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

---

Commissioner for Patents  
United States Patent and Trademark Office  
P.O. Box 1450  
Alexandria, VA 22313-1450  
[www.uspto.gov](http://www.uspto.gov)

**MAILED**

DEC 19 2005

Technology Center 2600

**BEFORE THE BOARD OF PATENT APPEALS  
AND INTERFERENCES**

Application Number: 09/801,613  
Filing Date: March 08, 2001  
Appellant(s): WIESEHUEGEL ET AL.

---

Robert H. Frantz  
For Appellant

**EXAMINER'S ANSWER**

This is in response to the appeal brief filed 5 October 2005 appealing from the Office action mailed 23 November 2004.

**(1) Real Party in Interest**

A statement identifying by name the real party in interest is contained in the brief.

**(2) Related Appeals and Interferences**

Appellant's statement identifying by name the real party in interest is contained in the brief and is correct.

**(3) Status of Claims**

The statement of the status of claims contained in the brief is correct.

**(4) Status of Amendments After Final**

The appellant's statement of the status of amendments after final rejection contained in the brief is correct.

**(5) Summary of Claimed Subject Matter**

The summary of claimed subject matter contained in the brief is correct.

**(6) Grounds of Rejection to be Reviewed on Appeal**

The appellant's statement of the grounds of rejection to be reviewed on appeal is correct.

**(7) Claims Appendix**

The copy of the appealed claims contained in the Appendix to the brief is correct.

**(8) Evidence Relied Upon**

20020059131

Goodwin et al.

05-2002

**(9) Grounds of Rejection**

The following ground(s) of rejection are applicable to the appealed claims:

Claims 1-23 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Goodwin et al., US Patent Application Publication US 2002/0059131. This rejection is set forth in a prior Office Action, mailed on 23 November 2004.

**(10) Response to Argument**

Appellant argues that Goodwin's seller profile is not controlled by a pre-existing contract between an offeror and a broker. However, the Examiner notes claim 1 reads:

...said entitlement definitions being determined by and controlled by a previously established reseller contract **between an offeror and a guest auction participant** in a manner which prevents a guest auction participant from modifying the entitlement schema; (emphasis added)

A reseller is one who resells; to resell is to sell again, usually to a new party.<sup>1</sup> A purchaser can be a reseller, as Goodwin discloses:

For example, this data can be original Financial product data or updates to Financial product data (if the **Seller resells the Financial product**). One reason for providing this material is so that the system (and/or an Analyst) can assemble a Detailed Summary Document after a request to do so is received from the Seller. (page 9, table 1, emphasis added)

---

<sup>1</sup> MERRIAM WEBSTER'S Collegiate Dictionary.

Art Unit: 3625

[0122] In one embodiment, the data uploaded to the site is in PDF format files built from Microsoft Word and Microsoft Excel templates downloaded from the system 30. For example, this data can be original financial product data or updates to financial product data (if the ***Seller 102 resells the financial product***). (Emphasis added)

A contract is a binding agreement between two or more persons or parties.<sup>2</sup>

Goodwin discloses resellers and pre-existing agreements. For example:

[0111] ...The ***profile*** of a Seller 102, in one embodiment, also stores other information provided by a Seller 102, such as preferences, criteria for accepting bids, restrictions on bids (e.g., certain users may be prohibited from bidding), restrictions on access to information (***bidders may be required to sign on and/or acknowledge specific conditions BEFORE receiving information***), specification of type of bidding to occur (e.g., type of auction), ***permission for the system 30*** to accept bids on behalf of the Seller 102, etc. This type of information also can be provided in the forms 282, 284, 286, 288. Goodwin, paragraph 111, emphasis added

[0070] User Management 40 is a subsystem providing user management functions for users of the system 30. These users, in at least one embodiment, can be sellers and potential sellers of financial products, buyers and potential buyers of financial products, so-called ***market observers*** (users who ***can view*** the transactions occurring on the site and/or the financial products available on the site, ***but who are not necessarily participating in any transactions***), ***visitors***, ***"guest" users***, ***auditing personnel***, etc. For example, in at least one embodiment, the User Management 40 subsystem provides interface to data such as user ***profile*** data, user preference data, stored search/***filter results***, lists of financial products for which a user has purchased due diligence or other information, a user registration component to handle ***initial site registration***, login/authentication functions, an interface that allows a system administrator or quality control person ***to "activate" the ability for a Buyer or Seller to conduct transactions, and the like***.

Thus, guest profiles are controlled by pre-existing contracts between offeror and guest. Goodwin discloses agreements that are binding, in that a guest is able to view certain information if he accepts, signs on and/or acknowledge specific conditions ***before*** receiving information.

As previously noted, Goodwin does not use *Appellant's* label "...***previously-established reseller contract...***" However, the labels given to various actors and modules do not move to impact either the elements of the system or the steps of the

---

<sup>2</sup> Definition of contract, MERRIAM WEBSTER'S Collegiate Dictionary.

method in any way which provides the patentable moments necessary in distinguishing the instant system and method from that of Goodwin.

In response to Appellant's arguments concerning disclosures in Goodwin, the fact that Appellant has recognized another advantage which would flow naturally from following the suggestion of the prior art cannot be the basis for patentability when the differences would otherwise be obvious. See *Ex parte Obiaya*, 227 USPQ 58, 60 (Bd. Pat. App. & Inter. 1985).

Appellant argues that Goodwin fails to recognize problems allegedly solved by appellant. In response to applicant's argument that there is no suggestion to combine the references, the examiner recognizes that obviousness can only be established by combining or modifying the teachings of the prior art to produce the claimed invention where there is some teaching, suggestion, or motivation to do so found either in the references themselves *or in the knowledge generally available to one of ordinary skill in the art*. See *In re Fine*, 837 F.2d 1071, 5 USPQ2d 1596 (Fed. Cir. 1988) and *In re Jones*, 958 F.2d 347, 21 USPQ2d 1941 (Fed. Cir. 1992).

#### **(11) Related Proceeding(s) Appendix**

No decision rendered by a court or the Board is identified by the examiner in the Related Appeals and Interferences section of this examiner's answer.

For the above reasons, it is believed that the rejections should be sustained.

Respectfully submitted,


December 9, 2005

Conferees

  
James Zurita  
Patent Examiner  
Art Unit 3625

  
Jeffrey Smith  
Patent Examiner  
Art Unit 3625

  
John Weiss  
Appeals Specialist  
Supervisory Patent Examiner  
Art Unit 3629

  
WYNN W. COGGINS  
SUPERVISORY PATENT EXAMINER  
TECHNOLOGY CENTER 3600

IBM CORPORATION (RHF)  
C/O ROBERT H. FRANTZ  
P. O. BOX 23324  
OKLAHOMA CITY, OK 73123